

Remarks/Arguments:

This is a reply to the office action of December 10.

The drawing has been amended by adding the legend “PRIOR ART” to Fig. 1a, as the examiner required.

The examiner correctly noted an antecedent basis problem in Claim 1; that has been corrected. A similar problem has been corrected in claim 3.

Claim 1 is currently rejected as anticipated by Roudebush et al. (U.S. Patent 4112173). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention aims to provide good releasing qualities for a plastic membrane which is placed on formwork against which concrete is cast. Roudebush, likewise, is concerned with obtaining good releasing qualities when casting concrete against a surface. In Roudebush et al., an electric *field* is applied to a plastic film while the plastic film is being bonded to paper. Col. 3, lines 27 to 32 describes various ways for covering paper with molten plastic. A single sentence at lines 29 - 31 suggests the application of an electric field. Roudebush’s method for covering paper does not, however, have any disclosed influence on the surface energy of the product or its release qualities and would not, we submit, inherently have any lasting effect.

A corona discharge is one type of electrical discharge. Discharge implies electron or particle flow. An electric field, as Roudebush describes, would normally be understood to be a static field not producing any flow. While it is possible to increase any static field strength to a point where discharge occurs, no such occurrence is disclosed or suggested by Roudebush. The sole disclosed purpose he discloses for his electric field is to better bond the plastic to the paper, and this suggestion is in the context of a

paragraph explaining how one may bond plastic to paper. No mention is made of a beneficial release quality resulting from the discharge. Indeed, bonding and releasing are opposite qualities, and Roudebush attributes his good release qualities only to the nature of the plastic (high density polyethylene).

We submit that claim 1, which requires a coating which is treated “using an electrical discharge treatment” is novel over Roudebush et al. and achieves a useful result.

In Japanese publication 56028971 (cited in the rejection of claims 2 and 3), a plastic film is glued on a plywood plate and the manufactured combination is used as a material for a concrete casting form. As we understand this publication, it, like Roudebush, discloses using corona treatment to facilitate glueing of the plastic film, but not to improve the quality of the concrete surface. Also, the film seems to be not against the concrete mass but actually on the opposite surface of the plywood plate. This publication shares the deficiencies of Roudebush et al. mentioned above, and would not, therefore, render claim 1 obvious.

For the reasons given above, we believe that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record, that dependent claims 2 and 3 are therefore patentable as well, and that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles Fallow/

Charles W. Fallow
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.
10 Post Office Road - Suite 100
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
March 10, 2009